

## Remarks

In the present response, eight claims (1, 22, 24, 26, 30, 32, 40, 45) are amended; three claims (23, 31, 33) are canceled; and twelve claims (46-57) are newly presented. Claims 34-39 are withdrawn. Applicants believe that no new matter is entered.

### **I. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(e)**

Claims 1-22, 28-29, and 40-44 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Voorhies et al. (USPN 6,504,542, hereinafter Voorhies). This rejection is traversed.

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See MPEP § 2131, also, *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Since Voorhies neither teaches nor suggests each element in claims 1-22, 28-29, and 40-44, these claims are allowable over Voorhies.

For convenience, claim 1 is reproduced below:

#### **Claim 1 (Emphasis Added)**

1. A method of traversing pixels of a graphic object with a fragment stamp, the fragment stamp having a plurality of probe points, the graphic object being defined with respect to an array of pixels that is divided into an array of contiguous but non-overlapping stamp positions at which the fragment stamp can be placed, the method comprising, at a current one of the stamp positions, evaluating whether a plurality of stamp positions that are adjacent to the current stamp position are valid positions, wherein the evaluating step further comprises determining, at the current stamp position, whether a segment formed by two of the probe points intersects the graphic object and wherein at least one of the two probe points are exterior to the current stamp position, the evaluating step further comprising determining whether a stamp position is a sliver position, a sliver position being a valid position that will not generate an additional valid position.

Independent claim 1 recites numerous limitations that are not taught or suggested in Voorhies. For example, claim 1 recites “the evaluating step further comprising determining whether a stamp position is a sliver position, a sliver position being a valid position that will not generate an additional valid position.” By contrast, Voorhies does not teach or suggest this recitation.

As indicated in the Office Action, Voorhies does teach snap locations. Voorhies discusses snap locations in columns 32 and 33:

If the rightmost sense points are not positioned outside the same edge or edges of the primitive, rightward movement is permitted and a position (X and Y coordinates) to the right of the current position is stored as a snap location in operation 2802. If, however, both rightmost sense points are positioned outside one or more edges of the primitive, rightward movement is not permitted and operation 2802 is skipped. (Col. 32, lines 44-52).

Next, in decision 2814, it is determined whether there is a snap location that resulted from operation 2802. (Col. 33, lines 36-38).

If it is determined in decision 2814 that a snap location does not exist, the process is done. If, however, a snap location does exist, the sense points are moved to the snap location in operation 2816. Thereafter, operations similar to those of operations 2804-2812 are executed to map a right side of the primitive. (Col. 33, lines 39-45).

Voorhies discussion of snap locations does not teach or suggest the claim limitations of sliver positions. As recited in claim 1, a sliver position is a valid position that will not generate an additional valid position.

All dependent claims that depend from claim 1 inherit all the limitations of base claim 1. As such, dependent claims of claim 1 are also allowable over Voorhies. Further, these dependent claims contain numerous limitations not taught or suggested in Voorhies.

#### **Claim 40**

At least for the reasons given above in connection with claim 1, claim 40 is also allowable over Voorhies. All dependent claims that depend from claim 40 inherit all the limitations of base claim 40. As such, dependent claims of claim 40 are also allowable over Voorhies. Further, these dependent claims contain numerous limitations not taught or suggested in Voorhies.

#### **II. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103**

Claims 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Voorhies in view of Choi et al. (USPN 6,285,376). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 30 is now written in independent form to incorporate all the limitations of dependent claim 31 that was indicated as being allowable. Claim 32 is now written in independent form to incorporate all the limitations of dependent claim 33 that was indicated as being allowable.

#### **III. Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 23-27, 31, 33, and 45 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing these claims.

In the present response, claim 22, 24, 26, 30, 32, and 45 are written in independent form to include all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

#### **IV. New Claims**

Applicants submit new claims 46-57. New claims 46-51 depend from claim 1, and new claims 52-57 depend from claim 40. These new claims recite numerous limitations that are not taught or suggested in the art of record.


### CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. (281) 514-8236, Facsimile No. (281) 514-8332. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

**Hewlett-Packard Company**  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

  
Philip S. Lyren  
Reg. No. 40,709  
Ph: 281-514-8236

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope address to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 5/26/04 day of May, 2004.

By   
Name: Be Henry